



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,376	04/13/2001	David K. Rensin	OS-003A	3436
35856	7590	12/30/2005	EXAMINER	
SMITH FROHWEIN TEMPEL GREENLEE BLAHA, LLC P.O. BOX 88148 ATLANTA, GA 30356			MEKY, MOUSTAFA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/834,376	RENSIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Moustafa M. Meky	2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-52 and 61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7,9-32,34-52 and 61 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 8 and 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2157

1. The amendment filed 10/7/2005 has been entered and considered by the examiner.
2. Claims 1-52 & 61 are presenting for examination.
3. Claims 1-11 & 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. **Claim 1 (lines 9-10)** states that **the information obtained from the web site to create links in the user interface** (notice that this information obtained from the web site to be used by the second application and not to link it, see lines 3-5). These limitations are not fully supportive in the specification
Therefore, it can be seen from the above discussion that claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph.
4. Claims 9 -16, 34-41, 61 recite the limitation "the address book application". There are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.
5. Claims 17-18 & 42-43 recite the limitation "the calendar application". There are insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.
6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the

international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-7, 19-32, 44-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Smethers (US Patent No. 6,463,304).

8. As to claims 1 & 19, Smethers shows in Figs 1 & 3B, 4, a system for automatically accessing Internet information (such as sports, travel or news or weather, see Fig 3B) from a first local application (launch application 400, see Fig 4, col 7, lines 8-13) on a handheld Internet appliance 100 (Fig 1), the system comprising:

- a software plug-in to automatically launch a second local application (browser application) from the first local application (launch application) and to automatically transfer information obtained from a web site (such as sports the web site, the news web site, the weather web site, etc) and stored in the appliance 300 to the second local application (browser application), see Fig 3B, col 6, lines 30-43;
- a user interface 104 (Fig 1) in the first local application (launch application) to enable the user to launch the second local application (browser application) in which the user interface 104 has links to the second local application (browser application), see col 3, lines 60-67, col 4, lines 1-41; and
- inherently a local database to store the information obtained from the web site.

9. As to claim 2, the handheld 100 is a wireless pda, see col 3, lines 25, 50-54.

10. As to claim 3, the applications include address book application, calendar application, etc, see col 4, lines 20-41.

11. As to claim 4, the web site (such as the weather web site) is inherently formatted for display on the handheld 100.
12. As to claims 5-6, the handheld 100 inherently has databases to store data entered by the users to the different applications.
13. As to claim 7, the software plug-in has different routines to implement different purposes such as launching second local application (browser application) from the first local application (launch application 400)
14. As to claims 20-32, 44-52, the claims are similar in scope to claims 1-7, and they are rejected under the same rationale.
Therefore, it can be seen from paragraphs 8-14 that Smethers anticipates claims 1-7, 19-32, 44-52.
15. Claim 8 & 33 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
16. Claims 9-11, 14-18, 34-43 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
17. Claim 12-13 & 61 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Lazaridis (US Pat. No. 6,691,111) teaches launching a second application (such as the calendar application) from an opening first application (such as email application), see col 2, lines 34-36, col 4, lines 60-67, col 5, lines 1-3.
- Rouse (US2002/0087628) teaches access a second application from a first application, see [0054].

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Moustafa M. Meky whose telephone number is 571-272-4005. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MMM
12/26/2005



Moustafa M. Meky
PRIMARY EXAMINER